

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-4 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Usui (U.S. Patent No. 6,414,630) (hereinafter “Usui”). Claims 5 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Usui.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have added new claims 8-14 by this amendment in order to differently describe the invention and afford the Applicants with scope to which they are entitled. Accordingly, claims 1-14 are now pending.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a)

Claims 1-4 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Usui. Claims 5 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Usui. These rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Independent claims 1, 2 and 3 each recite a “setting part for setting said other mobile vehicle either in a valid state or in an invalid state.” This allows a user to select whether to disable or enable the display of a particular mobile vehicle at any particular time. Applicants respectfully submit that the Usui arrangement, on the other hand, differs from the claimed arrangement in that the identification data judgement means 6 will only allow another mobile vehicle’s information to be displayed to a user if the other mobile vehicle’s information is predetermined identification information. Applicants’ claimed combinations go beyond this

feature by allowing a user to enable and/or disable any of its predetermined other vehicle information at any particular time by setting the other mobile vehicle either in a valid state or in an invalid state via the user's input setting of the setting part.

Moreover, independent claim 2 further recites a "mobile vehicle position return part for returning a mobile vehicle return position message ... when said determining part determines that said other mobile vehicle is set in the valid state." Applicants respectfully submit that such an arrangement is not disclosed by Usui.

Independent claim 3 also recites a "transmitter for transmitting a mobile vehicle position request message for requesting another mobile vehicle for its position." Applicants respectfully submit that such an arrangement is not disclosed by Usui.

Independent claim 4 recites a system including a mobile vehicle that includes a "transmitter for transmitting position information indicative of the own position to said communication service center to transmit said position information to a mobile vehicle navigation apparatus equipped in another mobile vehicle." Moreover, the communication service center is recited as including a "transmitter for transmitting said received position information to a mobile vehicle navigation apparatus equipped in another mobile vehicle." Even further, the mobile vehicle navigation apparatus equipped in said other mobile vehicle is recited as including a display part "wherein the position of said one mobile vehicle is displayed on the display of the mobile vehicle navigation apparatus equipped in said other mobile vehicle." Applicants respectfully submit that such an arrangement is not disclosed by Usui.

The Office Action alleges that the "taxi/service control center meets the scope of the claims directed to use with a communication service center." Applicants respectfully traverse

this position at least because Usui merely discloses that “a taxi control center issues commands to taxis with radio transmitter-receivers.” Usui goes on to disclose that the taxi service control center or a delivery service control center may utilize the disclosed arrangement to “accurately confirm the positions of the taxis ... so that the taxis service control center ... can issue commands more easily.” However, Applicants respectfully submit that there is no teaching or suggestion in Usui at least of transmitting navigation position information for display between two vehicles via a communication service center or transmitting navigation position information from a communication service center to a mobile vehicle navigation apparatus equipped in a mobile vehicle.

Similarly with regard to independent claim 6, Applicants respectfully submit that there is no teaching or suggestion in Usui at least of transmitting navigation position information for display between two vehicles via a communication service center or transmitting navigation position information from a communication service center to a mobile vehicle navigation apparatus equipped in a mobile vehicle.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a) should be withdrawn because the applied references do not teach or suggest each feature of independent claims 1-4 and 6. As pointed out in MPEP § 2131, “[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim.” Thus, “[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).” Similarly, MPEP § 2143.03 instructs that “[t]o establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or

suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 409 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974)."

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that dependent claims 5 and 7 are allowable at least because of their respective dependence upon independent claims 4 and 6, and the reasons set forth above.

Newly-Added Claims 8-14

Claims 8-14 have been added in order to differently describe the invention and provide the Applicants with scope to which they are entitled. It is respectfully submitted that these claims are in condition for allowance over the art of record.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

EXCEPT for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required,

including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account

50-0310. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR
EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Dated: November 22, 2002

By:



Paul A. Fournier
Reg. No. 41,023

CUSTOMER NO. 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Tel: 202-739-3000
Fax: 202-739-3001